

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ANTHONY FESTA,
Plaintiff(s),

v.

BRIAN SANDOVAL, et al.,
Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:17-cv-00850-APG-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 98]

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to extend. Docket No. 98. For the reasons discussed below, the motion is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part.

As an initial matter, the motion seeks relief from two different deadlines, the deadline to amend the complaint and the deadline to effectuate service. The local rules require the filing of separate motions for each request. *See* Local Rule IC 2-2(b). Plaintiff must comply with this rule in the future.

As to the request to extend the deadline to amend the complaint, that deadline is currently set at June 8, 2020. Docket No. 97 at 11. Plaintiff argues that he needs an additional 30 days to prepare an amended complaint because, despite his efforts to comply with that deadline, he has encountered difficulties given his *pro se* status. Docket No. 98 at 2. Although a thin showing, the Court will allow this extension. This aspect of the motion is **GRANTED** and the deadline to amend the complaint is **EXTENDED** to July 8, 2020.

1 As to the request to extend the service deadline, that deadline expired on August 27, 2019.
2 Docket No. 74 at 2. Plaintiff's motion indicates that this deadline should now be extended so that
3 he can raise the funds needed to effectuate service. Docket No. 98 at 2. This showing is not
4 sufficient, as Plaintiff must explain at this juncture why the preceding year was insufficient to
5 complete service. *E.g., Bivins v. Ryan*, 2013 WL 2004462, at *3 (D. Ariz. May 13, 2013)
6 ("Dismissal of a party is appropriate where a plaintiff fails to show good cause for delays in
7 service"). The instant motion does not provide good cause for not effectuating service to date.
8 Accordingly, this aspect of the motion to extend will be **DENIED** without prejudice. Plaintiff
9 must file, by June 19, 2020, an explanation as to why the claims against Defendants Pugh, Jackson,
10 and Provencal should not be dismissed for lack of service and, instead, why this deadline should
11 be revived and extended. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).

12 For the reasons discussed above, the motion to extend time is **GRANTED** in part and
13 **DENIED** in part.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: June 5, 2020

16
17 
18 _____
19 Nancy J. Koppe
20 United States Magistrate Judge
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28